UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/724,349	11/27/2000	William F. Price III	NA00-13801	7294

23419	7590	07/16/2004

COOLEY GODWARD, LLP
3000 EL CAMINO REAL
5 PALO ALTO SQUARE
PALO ALTO, CA 94306

EXAMINER
LEMMA, SAMSON B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11/27/2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-21 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
> set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
> patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious
> at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
> subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al

(hereinafter refereed to as Liu) (U.S. Patent No. 6,760,752) in view of Newman (U.S. Patent No.

5,671,285)

4.   As per claims 1, 8, and 15, Liu teaches the method, a computer readable storage

medium storing instruction or an apparatus for managing public keys through a server,

comprising:

receiving a client public key from a client at the server; (column 12, lines 42-45; see

also figure 1).

storing the client public key in a database at the server; (column 7, lines 13-14; column

20, lines 8-9;column 21, lines 54-55; column 12, lines 46-47; see also figure 2D;

column 14, line 8)

allowing other clients to lookup the client public key in the database; (column 26, lines

2-10; column 25, lines 27-36)

sending a verification request from the server to the client asking if the client public

key remains valid; and (column 29, 33-35) (It is interpreted by the office that sending a

verification request from the server to the client asking if the client public key is to be

deleted or to remain valid whenever the client takes the initiative of deleting a key meets

the recitation of this limitation).

If an affirmative response to the verification request is not received, removing the client

public key from the database. (column 29, lines 36-39).(It is interpreted by the office

that removing the client public key form the database if an affirmative response to the

verification request to delete the key is received by the server meets the recitation of this

limitation).

Furthermore, Liu discloses the steps of verifying the status or the validity of a

public key (column 2; line 1). Liu does not explicitly teach that the sending of a

verification request form the server to the client asking if the client public key remains

valid is done periodically. However, Newman discloses periodically sending a verification

request (check) form the server or CDC (central database controller) to the client (Fax

terminal) to verify the validity of the key and eventually update the client's public key

(remove or replace the old public key with the new one) (Column 6, lines 1-3; column 5,

lines 52-55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to combine Liu's sending of a verification request to check

the validity of the public key as per teachings of Newman, in order to periodically verify

the validity of the client's public key and eventually update the public key if necessary.

5.   As per claims 2, 9, and 16, the combination of Liu and Newman disclose the method, a

computer readable storage medium storing instruction or an apparatus as applied to claim 1, 8

and 15 above. Furthermore Liu discloses the method wherein storing the client public key in

the database involves:

     signing the client public key using a server private keys; (column 13, lines 32-34) and

     storing the signed client public key in the database.(column 13, lines 32-34).

6.   As per claims 3, 10, and 17, the combination of Liu and Newman disclose the method, a

computer readable storage medium storing instruction or an apparatus as applied to claim 1, 8

and 15 above. Furthermore Liu discloses the method further comprising:

     receiving a request at the server to remove the client public key from the database

     ;(column 29, lines 26-28)

     if the request is signed with a corresponding client private key, removing the client

     public key from the database.(column 29, lines 36-38)(the office interprets the E-mail

     confirmation response from the client to the server to confirm the removing of the key

     meets the recitation of this limitation).

7.   As per claims 4, 11, and 18, the combination of Liu and Newman disclose the method, a computer readable storage medium storing instruction or an apparatus as applied to claim 1, 8 and 15 above. Furthermore, Liu discloses the method wherein the client public key is removed from the database only if an affirmative response is not received after sending multiple verification requests at different times. (column 29, lines 36-39; column 2, line 1). (It is interpreted by the office that sending a verification request from the server to the client asking if the client public key is to be deleted or to remain valid whenever the client takes the initiative of deleting a key meets the recitation of this limitation).

8.   As per claims 5, 12, and 19, the combination of Liu and Newman disclose the method, a computer readable storage medium storing instruction or an apparatus as applied to claim 1, 8 and 15 above. Furthermore, Liu discloses the method of wherein storing the client public key in the database at the server involves:

> attempting to validate an association between a client email address and the client
> public key; and (column 14, lines 8-13)
> if the association is successfully validated, storing the association in the
> database.(column 14, lines 8-13).

9.   As per claims 6, 13, and 20, the combination of Liu and Newman disclose the method, a computer readable storage medium storing instruction or an apparatus as applied to claim 5, 12 and 19 above. Furthermore, Liu discloses the method wherein the database contains at most one key for each email address. (column 14, lines 8-10).(the office interprets the reference used does not indicate at any place the duplication of the key for each email address and this meets the recitation of this claim.)

10.   As per claims 7, 14, and 21, the combination of Liu and Newman disclose the method,

a computer readable storage medium storing instruction or an apparatus as applied to claim 5,

12 and 19 above. Furthermore, Liu discloses the method wherein the database contains at

most one email address for each key.(column 14, lines 8-10).(the office interprets the reference

used does not indicate at any place the duplication of the email address for each key and this

meets the recitation of this claim).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Samson B Lemma whose telephone number is 703-305-8745.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 am---4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, BARRON JR GILBERTO can be reached on 703-305-1830. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAMSON LEMMA

July 9, 2004

JUSTIN T. DARROW
PRIMARY EXAMINER